

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

STEVEN WAYNE BONILLA,  
Plaintiff,

v.

JUDGE CLARENCE DON CLAY, et. al.,  
Defendants.

Case Nos. [21-cv-02926-PJH](#)  
[21-cv-02927-PJH](#)  
[21-cv-02928-PJH](#)  
[21-cv-02929-PJH](#)  
[21-cv-02930-PJH](#)  
[21-cv-02931-PJH](#)  
[21-cv-03055-PJH](#)

**ORDER DISMISSING MULTIPLE  
CASES WITH PREJUDICE**

Plaintiff, a state prisoner, has filed multiple pro se civil rights complaints under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff is a condemned prisoner who also has a pending federal habeas petition in this court with appointed counsel. See *Bonilla v. Ayers*, Case No. 08-0471 YGR. Plaintiff is also represented by counsel in state court habeas proceedings. See *In re Bonilla*, Case No. 20-2986 PJH, Docket No. 1 at 7.

In these civil rights cases plaintiff names as defendants various federal and state judges and the correctional officers' union. Plaintiff presents very similar claims in these actions. He seeks relief regarding his underlying conviction or how his other cases were handled by the state and federal courts.

To the extent that plaintiff seeks to proceed *in forma pauperis* (IFP) in these cases, he has been disqualified from proceeding IFP under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) unless he is "under imminent danger of serious physical injury" at the time he filed his complaint. 28 U.S.C. 1915(g); *In re Steven Bonilla*, Case No. 11-3180 CW; *Bonilla v. Dawson*, Case No. 13-0951 CW.

The allegations in these complaints do not show that plaintiff was in imminent danger at the time of filing. Therefore, he may not proceed IFP. Moreover, even if an

1 IFP application were granted, his lawsuits would be barred under *Heck v. Humphrey*, 512  
2 U.S. 477, 486-87 (1994), *Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37, 43-54 (1971), *Demos v. U.S.*  
3 *District Court*, 925 F.2d 1160, 1161-62 (9th Cir. 1991) or *Mullis v. U.S. Bankruptcy Court*,  
4 828 F.2d 1385, 1393 (9th Cir. 1987). Accordingly, the cases are dismissed with  
5 prejudice.

6 Furthermore, these are not cases in which the undersigned judge's impartiality  
7 might be reasonably questioned due to the repetitive and frivolous nature of the filings.  
8 *See United States v. Holland*, 519 F.3d 909, 912 (9th Cir. 2008) (absent legitimate  
9 reasons to recuse himself or herself, a judge has a duty to sit in judgment in all cases  
10 assigned to that judge).<sup>1</sup>

11 The clerk shall terminate all pending motions and close these cases. The clerk  
12 shall return, without filing, any further documents plaintiff submits in these closed cases.

13 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

14 Dated: April 29, 2021

15  
16 /s/ Phyllis J. Hamilton

17 PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON  
18 United States District Judge

19 T:\PJHALL\\_psp\2021\Bonilla '21\Bonilla Dismissals2.docx  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26  
27 <sup>1</sup> Plaintiff names the undersigned as defendant in one of these cases. Case No. 21-cv-  
28 02928-PJH. The complaint raises no specific allegations against the undersigned and is  
frivolous. Plaintiff does not seek recusal, nor is recusal warranted in light of the frivolous  
nature of the case.